

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are amended. Claims 1-6, 23-28 and 36-41 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

§ 101 Rejections

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite [added language appears in bold italics]:

One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed, implement, in an extensible electronic document editor, a selection services component comprising a selection services interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor and provide a customized model for the selection function, and to clear, add or remove a segment from a selection object using the customized model for the selection function.

In making out the rejection, the Office argues that “a selection services component is not directed to statutory subject matter” (Office Action, Page 3). Applicant disagrees but, in the interest of advancing prosecution, has amended the claim as indicated above. Applicant submits that the above amendment traverses the Office’s rejection.

Claims 2-6 have been amended and, for the reasons set forth above, are allowable as well.

1 **§ 102 Rejections**

2 Claims 1-6, 23-28 and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as
3 allegedly being anticipated by Simpson (Mastering Wordperfect® 5.1 & 5.2 For
4 Windows™, 1993).

5
6 **The Claims**

7 **Claim 1** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-
8 readable instructions thereon which, when executed, implement, in an extensible
9 electronic document editor, *a selection services component* comprising *a selection*
10 *services interface* that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension
11 to override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor and
12 provide a customized model for the selection function, and to clear, add or remove
13 a segment from a selection object using the customized model for the selection
14 function. **(emphasis added).**

15 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that claim 1 is
16 anticipated by Simpson. The Applicant disagrees.

17 Specifically, the Office alleges that Simpson discloses a selection services
18 component citing to (pages 512, 514, and 517-518) of Simpson for support. To
19 assist the Office in appreciating an exemplary selection services component as
20 contemplated in this claim, the Office is respectfully referred to the Application
21 (page 27) reproduced below.

22
23 Selection services provides extensions a way to modify a selection
24 process of an extensible editor to which the designers are coupled...
25 interfaces exposed by a selection services component [to] allow extensions
 to properly communicate with an extensible editor to utilize the selection
 services component.

1
2 Simpson, on the other hand, discloses a process for creating a macro,
3 describing a macro, replacing a macro and running a macro. Simpson's macro is
4 simply not the same as, nor is it equivalent to Applicant's recited selection
5 services component. Simpson neither discloses nor suggests a selection services
6 component as recited in this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim
7 is allowable.
8

9 Further, the Office alleges that Simpson discloses a selection services
10 interface that provides...a customized model for the selection function, citing to
11 (pages 517-518 and 520) of Simpson for support. Because Simpson does not
12 disclose or suggest a selection services component as indicated above, it is
13 virtually impossible for Simpson to disclose or suggest a selection services
14 interface that provides...a customized model for the selection function as recited
15 in this claim. To assist the Office in appreciating an exemplary selection services
16 interface as contemplated in this claim, the Office is respectfully referred to the
17 Application (pages 27-28) reproduced below:
18

19 The role of the selection services interface[s]...is to provide
20 designers or other editing extensions with the ability to modify the logical
21 selection state. Consequently, all editing commands and services can
22 interact with a custom selection model without having detailed knowledge
23 of the designer that is implementing the selection...The selection services
24 interface provides methods to programmatically clear, add and remove
25 segments from a selection object...The interfaces can be utilized by an
extension that is coupled with the extensible editor to add new features to
the editor, to augment existing features, or to override the editor's default
behavior.

1 Simpson, on the other hand, discloses a macro user interface that allows a
2 user to edit the text of an user created macro. This macro may then be saved to
3 overwrite the pre-existing macro, thus creating a new macro. Simpson's macro
4 user interface is simply not the same as, nor is it equivalent to Applicant's recited
5 selection services interface. Simpson neither discloses nor suggests a selection
6 services interface as recited in this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this
7 claim is allowable.

8 For all of these reasons, this claim is allowable.
9

10 **Claims 2-6** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
11 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor
13 suggested by Simpson.

14 **Claim 23** recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable
15 instructions for one or more interfaces that, when executed by an extensible
16 electronic document editor on a computer, perform the following steps:
17

- 18 • override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor to
19 provide a *customized model for the selection function*;
- 20 • receive parameters from a designer through a *selection services interface*;
- 21 • utilize the parameters to clear, add or remove a selected segment from a
22 selection object of an electronic document using the *customized model for*
23 *the selection function*;
- 24 • return values to the designer regarding the state of the selected segment.

25 (emphasis added)

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that claim 23 is
2 anticipated by Simpson. The Applicant disagrees.

3 Specifically, the Office alleges that Simpson discloses a customized model
4 for the selection function and a selection services interface, citing to (pages 512 -
5 515, 517-518 and 520) of Simpson for support.

6 Simpson discloses processes for creating a macro, describing a macro,
7 replacing a macro and editing a macro entry. All of which result in a customized
8 macro. However, the customized macro Simpson discloses is in no way similar to
9 the recited customized model for the selection function. Simpson neither discloses
10 nor suggests a customized model for the selection function. Accordingly, for at
11 least this reason, this claim is allowable.
12

13 Further, Simpson does not anticipate in any way a selection services
14 interface as recited in this claim. For at least this additional reason, this claim is
15 allowable.
16

17 For all of these reasons, this claim is allowable.

18 **Claims 24-28** depend from claim 23 and are allowable as depending from
19 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
20 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither shown
21 nor suggested by Simpson.

22 **Claim 36** recites a method for providing selection services to one or more
23 extensions in an extensible editor, the method comprising:
24
25

- receiving a request from an extension to utilize a *selection services component*;
- facilitating the request by presenting a *selection services interface* that is accessible by the extension and that overrides a selection function provided by the extensible editor to provide a customized model for the selection function; and
- communicating with the extension through the *selection services interface* to enable the extension to clear, add, or remove a selected segment from a selection object of an electronic document using the customized model for the selection function. **(emphasis added)**

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that claim 36 is anticipated by Simpson. The Applicant disagrees.

As discussed with regards to claim 1, Simpson does not anticipate in any way a selection services component or a selection services interface. Accordingly, for much the same reasons as discussed with regards to claim 1, Applicant submits that Simpson does not teach or suggest a selection services component or a selection services interface. For at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claims 37-41 depend from claim 36 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 36, are neither shown nor suggested by Simpson.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,

1 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an
2 interview.

3
4
5 Dated: 12 Feb 2007

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
By: David Thompson
Respectfully Submitted,
David Thompson
Reg. No. 37954
(509) 324-9256